

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant responds herein to the Office Action dated September 12, 2005.

Claim 1 has been rejected on grounds of anticipation by Kamiyama (5,339,293). Claims 2 and 5 stand rejected on grounds of obviousness over Kamiyama. Claims 4 and 7 stand rejected on grounds of obviousness over Kamiyama as applied to claim 1, in further view of Kresser (1,505,521). Claim 6 stands rejected on grounds of obviousness over Kamiyama as applied to claim 1, in further view of Biver (5,490,123). Claims 9-12 and 21 stand rejected on grounds of obviousness over Kamiyama as applied to claim 1, in further view of Farash (US 2003/0151980). Claims 13-14 stands rejected on grounds of obviousness over Kamiyama as applied to claim 1, in further view of Giger (4,655,606).

Claims 15-16 stand rejected on grounds of obviousness over Farash, in view of Giger. Claims 17-19 stand rejected on grounds of obviousness over Kamiyama as applied to claim 1, in further view of Heit (2,179,294). Lastly, claim 20 stands rejected on grounds of obviousness over Kamiyama as applied to claim 1, in further view of Manceri (3,672,157). Reconsideration is requested in view of the amendments to the claims herein and the following remarks.

The application contains two independent claims. These are claims 1 and 21. As amended, the language of claim 1 has been tightened to clearly indicate the following. The dial face is oval shaped, with the band of the watch being aligned, i.e., running along, the minor axis of the oval shape. The first time movement and the second time movement have centers that are spaced along the long axis of the oval shape and the minute handles of these two time movements are long enough so that these handles span.

This particular design enables the two watch movements to be large enough so that the handles can be more easily mentally associated with the series of hour indicia arranged along and following the circumferential boundary surrounding the interior region of the dial face.

Claim 1 also provides that the first time movement and the second time movement do not have dedicated hours indicia arranged around their centers.

In the primary Kamiyama reference, no oval shaped dial face is shown which is aligned with a long axis of the oval shape. Furthermore, the time movements 6a and 4a do not have their centers aligned with the longitudinal axis of an oval shape.

Still further, the time handles of these time movements have time indicia that are associated directly with them, as opposed to the recitation of claim 1. Still further, these time movements are very small and therefore their minute handles, do not span the long axis of an oval shape.

None of the references of record, whether they are taken singly or in combination, disclose the full features of the timepiece of claim 1.

The foregoing remarks are also generally applicable to independent claim 21.

The secondary Farash reference discloses two time movements, each with its own hour indicia and, moreover, these time movements are aligned along an axis which is coextensive with the band of the watch, unlike the inventions of independent claims 1 and 21.

The Office Action takes the position that Kresser discloses an oval watch face. Obviously, applicant did not invent the oval shape, per se. It is a geometric shape that exists in the art. The present invention is directed to a combination of elements which, taken together, result in a watch that has a first and second time movement which are quite large and spaced along the direction of the human arm, so that the movements are easily readable. In accordance with claim 1, neither of the time movements has its own respective time indicia associated therewith.

Kresser is an oval shape, but not in the manner, i.e., orientation of the present invention relative to the watch band. Kresser furthermore does not include two time movements spaced on the long axis in a direction which is not aligned with the watch band.

Relative to claim 9, the Examiner contends that Kamiyama has multi-stem buttons 4 which the Examiner implies are used for each of the different time movements. In fact, in accordance with the description at column 6, it appears that each button is associate with only one corresponding watch movement.

Based on the foregoing remarks, applicant respectfully submits that none of the independent claims are either anticipated or rendered obvious by the prior art of record. For the reasons noted above and because each of the dependent claims impose further limitations on their base claims, those

claims are even further distanced from the prior art. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that each of the pending claims in the application is clearly distinguishable over the prior art.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims as amended and pass this case to issue.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on November 14, 2005

MAX MOSKOWITZ

Name of applicant, assignee or
Registered Representative

Signature

November 14, 2005

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

MAX MOSKOWITZ

Registration No.: 30,576

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700